

MAENETTE KAPE‘AHIOKALANI PADEKEN BENHAM

The Voice“less” Hawaiian: An Analysis of Educational Policymaking, 1820–1960

The public schools are now, and have always been regarded as among the foremost social institutions in the Territory.

VAUGHAN MACCAUGHEY, 1909

ACROSS THE UNITED STATES TODAY, a growing number of non-dominant ethnic students are entering the public schools, renewing policy debates surrounding educational excellence versus equity for marginalized people. A historical examination of educational politics reveals that when competing social and political forces argue over the pursuit of educational goals, issues eventually become politicized with the potential reward being access to and participation in the governance system. Recently, an increasingly diverse and vocal populace has focused new attention on the policymaking process and its relationship to the educational experience and subsequent life choices of Native Americans.

The study of how educational policy has affected Native Hawaiians has been given little attention. Perhaps, not coincidentally, it has failed to receive attention because it has been somewhat lost in the history of the United States, which has focused on the politics of cultural domination through assimilation. This lack of contextual understanding of policymaking is further compounded by academic and social outcomes that have negatively affected Native American Indi-

Maenette K. P. Benham is an assistant professor of educational administration at Michigan State University and co-author of Culture and Educational Policy in Hawaii: The Silencing of Native Voices (1998).

The Hawaiian Journal of History, vol. 32 (1998)

ans, Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders and have jeopardized the perpetuation and success of their cultures.

The focus of this essay is to critically examine the intersection of political thought and educational policy processes at times and determine how these clusters of critical moments have helped define policy toward Native Hawaiians. This examination is anchored in a rigorous empirical study of 150 years of history,¹ and it unmasks the domination of colonialism that has defined a society seeking to erase Native Hawaiian history, culture, and language.

THE IMPACT OF THE AMERICAN MISSIONARIES, 1820–1840S

It is important to visualize life in Hawai‘i preceding the arrival of the American missionaries in order to better understand how rapidly change came about. Prior to the “re”discovery of Hawai‘i by Western explorers, the Hawaiian perspective of reality was relatively limited. That is not to say that the Hawaiian culture was not amazing for the Hawaiians had formed a complete social, political, and economic structure that was bound to the *kapu* system.² The impact, however, of new technology and foreign ideas began to change the Hawaiian perspective of reality, thereby affecting the way in which the people were governed and educated. For example, King Kamehameha I marshaled Western weaponry to gain control of the Islands and place them under one rule. In addition, because Western traditions and values often conflicted with the restrictive *kapu* this eventually led to the dismantling of the *kapu* system championed by Keōpuōlani and Ka‘ahumanu.³

In essence, long before the arrival of the American missionary, Hawai‘i had undergone rampant upheaval of its social-mythological, economic-agrarian, and political-kinship foundations⁴ and had experienced the ravaging effects of labor exploitation (whaling and sandalwood trade) and the introduction of disease and alcohol. Helena Allen writes that it was indeed a fortuitous arrival or a stunning coincidence that “The missionaries sailed into a religious vacuum in 1820. The old gods were officially gone; Ka‘ahumanu saw a way to provide new laws and fill the obvious need of the people for a ‘god.’”⁵ It was a time of great social and political despair.

Among the many fundamental tools carried by the American mis-

sionaries was the ability to establish a system of mandatory formal, Western schooling for all Native Hawaiians which would introduce American democratic liberalism into Hawaiian political thought.⁶ Increased missionary influence on Hawai'i's native rulers eventually led to the kingdom's first written constitution in 1840 and the appointment of several American missionaries to cabinet positions. Clearly, the appointments of the Reverend William Richards as a primary advisor to the throne, followed by other American Protestant missionaries, a legislature filled with Protestant-educated Native Hawaiians and Americans, and the designation of the Reverend Richard Armstrong to head Hawai'i's schools illustrates a shift in governmental leadership.

Education became centralized as a governmental responsibility in 1840. The missionary schools became government-sponsored "common schools," with instruction and texts for natives in the Hawaiian language. It is significant to note that Hawai'i's public school system was established only three years after Horace Mann secured similar school systems and laws in Massachusetts. The idea and structure of Hawai'i's schools were therefore an American invention. In this new structure, the minister of education, appointed by the monarch, was entrusted to take the lead in all educational policy decisions. The power and authority of this single position was supported by the appointment of like-minded school board members, thereby reserving the domain of school decision-making for the elite few. Insider power would be held by the elite Hawaiian monarchy and their (primarily) American advisors, who effectively controlled the content of learning for native students and a growing debate over English-only language instruction.

Hawai'i's first school laws, mandated in 1842, were similar to their continental counterparts, which sought two objectives. The first was to establish an efficient, centralized organizational structure that would enable schools to acculturate the Native Hawaiian citizenry adequately to Christian and democratic social and political norms.

13. There shall also be annually appointed certain men of intelligence as general school agents. . . . They shall be appointed by the legislature at their annual meeting. These persons shall be the school agents for the year.

14. The business of the general school agents shall be to consult with the school committees and teachers in accordance with what is before stated. The general school agents shall superintend, manage and provide for the teachers, and shall encourage them and their scholars. They also shall be the judges of the law in relation to schools. The Supreme Judges are the only persons above them.⁷

The second objective was to hold local school boards, teachers, parents, and students accountable to the laws.

12. It shall be the duty of the school committee to encourage the parents in whatever will promote the education of their children, and shall themselves encourage the children to go to school and acquire knowledge. . . .

It is important that parents should have so much sincere regard to the welfare of their children as to influence them to attend to instruction. For if they are unable to read, they can neither marry husbands nor wives, they can never act as land agents nor be employed in any office over others. . . .⁸

Emphasis was further placed on prescribing the character of those who would teach. Key personnel policy dictated the role of the teacher as the source through which new (Western) norms and behaviors were to be learned.

6. It is not proper that all teachers should be paid alike. A very wise teacher who is exceedingly laborious in his business, and has many pupils, should be paid a high price, while he who is less wise and less laborious in his business should be paid a lower price. . . .

18. Furthermore, it shall not be proper for the general school agent to give the teacher's certificate to ignorant persons, not to persons known to be vicious or immoral. If a man can read, write and understands geography and arithmetic, and is a quiet and moral man, and desires a teacher's certificate, it shall be the duty of the school agent to give him one, and not refuse.⁹

Although the public schools were financially supported by the local community (e.g., parents, chiefs) with little or no support from the king, there was little in the way of local governance. Community

participation in school governance was limited to petitioning the school agent for support, encouraging parents to promote education among their children, helping to build school structures, and working with the Christian-taught (i.e., Protestant) school teachers.

The activity of schooling was so popular that, as Benjamin Wist suggests, it became a substitute "for lost indigenous social activities."¹⁰ In fact, quarterly examinations included much pomp and ceremony in which natives eagerly and proudly participated. The Reverend Reuben Tinker wrote in his journal on July 19 and 20, 1831:

The shell horn blowing early for examination of the schools, in the meeting house. About 2000 scholars present, some wrapped in large quantity of native cloth, with wreaths of evergreen about their heads and hanging toward their feet—others dressed in calico and silk with large necklaces of braided hair and wreaths of red and yellow and green feathers very beautiful and expensive.¹¹

The curriculum content prescribed reflected both a Western perspective and a Christian point of view. S. M. Kamakau describes the rigidity and religious undercurrents of the classroom lessons:

The subjects taught were spelling in unison, reciting syllables of two letters; reciting a refusal to keep wooden gods; names of lands, names of months . . . portions of the books of Matthew, Psalms, Acts of the Apostles, and Luke; questions relating to God; the Ten commandments; questions prepared for the exhibition; the desire of the rulers proclaimed at Honuakaha; the first hymn about 'Opu-kaha-ia; and the arithmetical processes of adding, multiplication tables, division, and fractions. . . . Some schools taught how to get ready, to stand, to speak out, to take up a slate, how to place the pencil on the slate, thus. . . . King Kau-i-ke-aouli laid great stress on the progress of education among the whole people and he continued attending school. . . . The spread of knowledge was very rapid in Hawai'i.¹²

While the content and instructional style were foreign to the Native Hawaiians, Tinker noted in his journal that they were dedicated to learning and were expert in writing and oration.

In short, Hawai'i's vulnerable political state, created by the turbu-

lence of the fall of the *kapu* system, made way for foreign religious constructs and the ambitions of the Western entrepreneur and the ideals of Manifest Destiny. Hawai'i's preferred social and political policy valued centralized governance by elite decision makers who could expediently and efficiently allocate resources for the Christian betterment of the whole community.¹³ Centralization of the public schools developed quickly as a means to influence social growth (assimilation) of the Native Hawaiian. Additionally, centralized control gave the government taxation power to finance common schools, determine who would teach, and define what would be learned. Whether the tiny island kingdom of Hawai'i was ready or not, a new tide was approaching.

HAWAI'I, NO LONGER FOR THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN, 1890-1920S

Parallel to the events of the Municipal Reform Movement in the cities of the United States, Hawai'i experienced a definitive move toward governance by an elite group of professionals who faced social economic problems caused by a growing population of non-Caucasians and heavy agricultural competition. In an effort to minimize conflict between the business elite and the Hawaiian monarchy and to assure that the many non-Caucasian groups were kept at the bottom of the social-economic pyramid, a revolution was needed. This came with the establishment in 1894 of the Republic of Hawai'i, predominantly composed of American business leaders who exploited popular sovereignty, thereby disenfranchising the Native Hawaiian.

This second period illustrates the sweeping social and political change initiated by the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. This ultimate tragedy gained momentum with the growth of sugar plantations and culminated in the signing of the Constitution of 1887. In effect, this document handed control of Hawai'i's land, resources, and people to the American foreigner. In the end, Queen Lili'uokalani's effort to abrogate this constitution led to the formal overthrow of the Hawaiian kingdom and the brief tenure of a primarily American-controlled Provisional Government in 1893, eventual establishment of the Republic of Hawai'i in 1894, Lili'uokalani's abdication in 1895, and the annexation of Hawai'i to the United States in 1898.¹⁴

Changes in governmental leadership led to a new constitution that redefined who could participate in the political system and institutionalized professional business domination. Within this context of limited participation in governance, Hawai'i's educational policy, stated in the new republic's Constitution of 1896, Act 57, clearly reflected the objectives of Americanization. This constitution and the educational policy it affirmed remained relatively intact even after Hawai'i was annexed to the United States in 1898. The motives for acculturating the diverse ethnic population of Hawai'i was identical to the motives of the Municipal Reformers. Educational historian David Tyack points out that:

... underlying much of the reform movement was an elitist assumption that prosperous, native born Protestant Anglo-Saxons were superior to other groups, and thus should determine the curriculum and the allocation of jobs. It was the mission of schools to imbue children of the immigrants and the poor with uniformly WASP ideals.¹⁵

Under the temporary governance of the Provisional Government (1893), followed by the Republic of Hawai'i (1894-1898), governance of Hawai'i reflected the values and beliefs of an elite oligarchy headed by Sanford B. Dole. W. R. Castle pointed to an interesting relationship between Dole and Professor John W. Burgess of Columbia University, who was reared in Germany and had been a student of Kant, Hegel, Treitschke, and Griest.¹⁶ Burgess believed that political structures were determined along racial lines and saw the Teutonic (of north European descent) political structure as superior. Having those of Teutonic ancestry or those who could be effectively socialized control participation in governance ensured that the principles advocated by the Anglo elite would be maintained.

This new governing elite, which valued centralized power and participation in governance by the appropriate elite tightfistedly governed the schools. In fact, every Board of Education president, his inspector general of schools, and the members of the Board of Education had been appointed by this elite power circle.¹⁷ Consequently, if groups had neither social nor economic prestige, they had little or no influence on school decisions.

Underlying educational policy during this period was the belief

that Americans (who dominated both government and business) should control the education and certification of teachers, the curriculum, and the finance and governance of schools. This set of events is similar to the Municipal Reform Movement on the continent in that it reshaped local governance of schools by giving control to business elites. With political consolidation resulting in control by a professional American elite, schools now came under one efficient system.¹⁸ In the laws of 1896, the first twelve regulations locate the administration of schools at an executive level and provide the department with policymaking power.

Section VIII: The Department may adopt rules and regulations not contrary to existing laws, for the government of all teachers and pupils, and its officers, agents and servants, and for the carrying out the general scheme of education and for the transaction of its business, which, when approved by the Executive Council and published, shall have the force and effect of law.¹⁹

The governing regulations clearly established centralized authority to appointed executive members of the Department of Public Instruction, who included the minister of the interior, six appointed commissioners, and an appointed inspector general. Free public schooling and compulsory school attendance policies, which also included enforcement procedures, were established. Furthermore, to assure that schools were kept to a conservative financial ledger, the laws gave resource-allocation authority to the Department of Public Instruction alone.

A centralized governing system provided for better accountability and acculturation of the Islands' youth, insuring the socialization of Western values. Perhaps the most important law required English instruction in all public schools, thereby excluding all that was Hawaiian. This policy, coupled with the outlawing of Hawaiian language instruction (1896), brought about a swift end to Hawaiian self-determination and identity and the beginning of the assimilation metaphor of unity within a melting pot.

Section XXX: The English language shall be the medium and basis of instruction at all public and private schools, provided that where it is

desired that another language shall be taught in addition to the English language, such instruction may be authorized by the Department. . . . Any schools that shall not conform to the provisions of this Section shall not be recognized by the Department.²⁰

Since the time of Armstrong, the schools had leaned heavily toward Americanization. Logically, then, the values and beliefs about democracy were reflected in textbooks, teacher-preparation programs, and curricular requirements. Speculation about the impact of education on the overthrow of Hawai'i and its subsequent annexation to the United States remains open for lively debate. Wist concludes:

The extent to which public education played a part in the events leading up to this climax will, of course, never be precisely known. That it was an influential factor can readily be inferred. Public education was a foster child of the American missionaries; and its growing success only increased the efforts of the opponents of Americanism in Hawai'i. Public education had contributed to the general adoption of the English language in the Islands—a factor of some significance in the American decision favoring annexation.²¹

Although school governance sought to restrict Native Hawaiian access to certain schools, under the guidance of H. S. Townsend, who replaced Alatau Atkinson in 1895, the schools began to champion a progressive education system. Townsend established an Island-wide teacher association and summer workshops for teachers and distributed the periodical *Progressive Education* to every teacher. In fact, in 1899, Townsend was able to bring John Dewey, leader of the progressive education movement, to Hawai'i. Laying a foundation for liberal and progressive education, Townsend "provided for the schools the first systematized course of study for general use, outlining the materials to be taught and listing the textual materials to be followed."²² However, these efforts to create equal access to educational opportunity would become the root of Townsend's undoing. The value of equal opportunity was in opposition to the existing social and political norms, which supported a two-class system consisting of the White-foreigner in the superior position and the Hawaiians and Asians (non-Caucasians) in the inferior position. The ideal of equity, just as

it had been defined by the Municipal Reform Movement, was fodder for semantic debate but was not to be practiced.

Overall, educational policy and subsequent school-related activity during this period suggests a reliance on efficient means to realize centralized school governance and finance of schools and strict control over a curricular program that taught natives how to think and behave appropriately. This common belief that non-Caucasians must "learn their place" was maintained by major agriculturists, who saw their laborers garnering grand ideas of career advancement during Townsend's tenure, which highlighted egalitarian ideals. Although he was not reappointed, the values of parity and individual-sovereignty had struck a deep chord and would find its champions in the 1940s and 1950s. Until then, educational policy would support the ideal that it was no good to be Hawaiian. One needed to be American and to think in English.²³

EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN POSTWAR HAWAI'I, 1945-1960s

To understand educational policy between 1945 and the 1960s, one must begin with a discussion of education in the early territorial years, 1900-1945, a period of strong Republican dominance. Perhaps the most excruciating problem for the schools' governing board was a growing ethnic population. The Asian population in Hawai'i, which began with 816 Chinese in 1860, had grown to overwhelming proportions. By 1920 there were 109,274 Japanese; 23,507 Chinese; 4,950 Koreans; and 21,021 Filipinos.²⁴ This burgeoning ethnic population was perceived as politically problematic because children born in Hawai'i would have the privilege of voting. Vaughan MacCaughy, superintendent between 1919 and 1923, wrote:

The next generation of voters will have a large proportion of Orientals. . . . As to the attitude which may be taken by these future voters on Territorial and National matters it is impossible to predict, but it is surely a National duty and a needed precaution to attempt to increase and diffuse patriotic ideas and conceptions of the duties of citizenship.²⁵

The Native Hawaiian voice is markedly absent from this earlier discourse because of a decreasing Hawaiian populace, lack of political

representation, and didactic indoctrination in schools that combined to deteriorate Native Hawaiian culture and self-esteem. With American customs and beliefs becoming more accepted among the growing numbers of part-Hawaiians and Hawaiians, knowledge and practice of old traditions were lost. As Mary K. Pukui, E. W. Haertig, and Catherine A. Lee wrote, "What was remembered would be recalled with increasing distortion. For when a specific practice was discarded or forgotten, there went with it the enduring, often wise concept from which the practice evolved."²⁶

In response to the ethnic problem and to further marginalize Native Hawaiians, the purpose and work of the public schools reflected an attitude of colonialist acculturation. MacCaughey continued to reiterate this purpose:

The harmonious development of the individual, physically, mentally, and morally. This is the fundamental basis of all good citizenship, of all efficient living. . . . This development is attained through the following media: (a) The correct usage of the official mode of expression, which is the spoken and written English language; (b) The important facts concerning the immediate and more remote environment of the child, the great truths learned by the human race during past ages, the principles of mathematics; (c) Manual Training, which may later be developed into definite industrial efficiency; (d) Habits of right living and moral conduct, both individual, and as a member of the school society.²⁷

Like the schools of the latter 1800s, Hawai'i's territorial Board of Education was composed of professionals appointed by the territorial governor, a superintendent who was appointed by the Board, and six commissioners again appointed by the governor and approved by the territorial Senate. To imply that school governance was not centralized and not influenced by political preference would be terribly ignorant. Centralization enhanced the quick ability of schools to disseminate directives as well as implement and monitor programs.

Political manipulation enhanced by economic power became the most effective means of assuring the stability of Americans on Hawaiian land. Their political endeavors valued privatization of conflict as a means of efficiently controlling all social institutions (e.g., schooling). This highly centralized governing structure was so entrenched

that the ruling elite, who became known as the Republican oligarchy, was able to maintain its hold over Hawai'i's governance from 1887 into the 1950s. During this time, the paternalistic actions of the Republican oligarchy resulted in a dual-school system, which claimed that high standards in education would be met by an English Standard School system. In reality, this policy was merely a mask for continued racial stratification that placed Caucasians in well-supplied schools with the better teachers, while all other ethnic groups were housed in substandard schools. Additionally, the Americanized curriculum continued to force students to speak standard English, as opposed to their native languages, and stressed industriousness, morality, and the doctrine of being a passive, consenting citizenry. Racial preferences, entrenched in the academic structure of Hawai'i's schools, found the elite Caucasian enjoying the benefits of economic and occupational superiority.

Nevertheless, the roots of Townsend's and Dewey's progressive movement in the late 1890s began to find its champions. The continental United States took a turn toward the Democratic Party with Franklin D. Roosevelt, which subsequently led to the appointments of more liberal territorial governors by Democratic presidents. This, in itself, began to sufficiently loosen the powerful political hold of the Republican oligarchy in Hawai'i. Additionally, the influx of progressive educators from the United States began to establish a stronghold in secondary school curriculum. What was occurring in the classroom is best expressed by Mitsuyuki Kido, one of the first teachers of Japanese descent:

I identified myself as a Democrat—I was enamored of FDR and his idealism. I tried to point out to my students some of the inequalities in the Hawaiian society—the political, economic and social structure was so controlled by a small group that I felt that the American dream of a free, democratic society was the thing we should try to achieve in Hawai'i.²⁸

The events of World War II would catapult Hawai'i into the global stream of the twentieth century. It saw the beginnings of strong unionized labor movements, and by 1954 the young Democrats, backed by these unions of working minorities, for the first time controlled the territorial legislature, a governance body that they conti-

nue to dominate to the present day. The platform on education of the young Democrats called for abolishing the colonial English Standard educational system, replacing it with a spirit of equal opportunity and wider participation in school governance.

With statehood in 1959 and the establishment of Democratic Party control by 1962, the once disenfranchised Nisei now controlled Hawai'i. However, the new elite did nothing to change the hierarchy that it had so recently despised. Maintaining the centralized governing structure of the past, the newly elected leaders quickly privatized conflict, limiting participation to the same types of subgroups. The primary players were still the governor's appointed school superintendent, key members of the now-dominant Democratic state legislature, and the state Finance Department. Closely involved with policy decisions were the new business leaders, unions, and the now elected school board composed of Democratic Party members. Far from the insider or near circle policy influentials, although in part given some small form of formal participation, were the Department of Education, parent groups, teacher groups, appointed school advisory boards, and Hawaiian and other ethnic interest groups.

The young Democrats' talk, which postulated a "politics of protest" against overpowering control, extended only to the end of the dual-school system and textbook fees and the election of a statewide school board, which did not appear as law until 1966.

Sec. 37—(Act 50, SL 1966). Board members; districts; composition. The board of education shall consist of eleven members. Eight members shall be elected by the qualified voters of the respective school board districts and three members shall be elected at-large in the City and County of Honolulu.

The overall objective of education during Hawai'i's territorial period was to "Americanize" the Native Hawaiian and other ethnic groups in preparation for probable statehood. This translated into public and independent school policies that mandated students be taught to speak Standard English and to work industriously in their assigned career tracks. School norms emphasized learning one's social rank, avoiding confrontation and competition with the elite, and accepting the territory's laws.

Reform meant institutionalizing the activity of tracking, curricu-

lum and teacher control, and financial manipulation. Financial authority was not in the hands of the elected school board, however, but in the control of the state Finance Department or in joint authority that also included the governor and the school board. One might assume that political outcry for equal opportunity (e.g., Brown Decision, civil rights movement) would translate into laws reflecting equity and choice. This was not the case. The push for wider participation in school governance during the 1950s and 1960s, with the exception of an elected school board, was not reflected in either the Hawai'i School Law of 1966 or the Constitution of 1969.

School reforms initiated by a new governing elite during this period, did not change the way in which schools were governed but did initiate movements toward parity that would be realized into the 1970s and 1980s. In brief, the events of World War II pushed the closed political system, with its finite, conservative components, toward a more open system that became inclusive of different, more liberal ideals. This encouraged a more open discourse about the educational system which to some extent led to new policies. What is significant about this period of political and educational reform is that it instills in the Native Hawaiians' collective mind that their needs can be met in an increasingly open political structure.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The structure of governance in Hawai'i has remained highly centralized and the traditions of authority and the exercise of power continue to reflect elite control of schools (see Table 1). In short, the *insiders* participated consistently in nearly all educational policy decisions. Their work informed and affected line budget items that determined what programs and what policies would receive resources and other governmental aid. Those players considered to be in the *near circle* were members of groups who through sheer financial interest of bloodlines were able to substantially persuade the insider policymakers. Members of the *far circle* were less crucial, but they had some power through organizational structure in the implementation of policy. The final two categories identified the *sometime players*, who had occasional influence, but along with the *forgotten players*, they were more likely recipients of policy decisions.

Table 1. Policy Influentials

Time Period	Insider	Near Circle	Far Circle	Sometime Player	Forgotten Player
1820-1840	Hawaiian monarch, regent, and high chiefs Rev. William Richards, king's advisor Appointed minister of public education Appointed council for education	American merchants American missionaries (i.e., teachers, printers, editors, attorneys) Hawaiian legislature (beginning 1842) Other cabinet members (advisors to the king) Republic legislature American business elite	Lesser Hawaiian Chiefs British consul District school inspectors Missionary school teachers American populace	Common school teachers Other religious denominations (e.g., Catholics, Mormons)	Native Hawaiian commoners Chinese immigrants
1890-1920s	Appointed cabinet Presidentially appointed school superintendent Presidentially selected board of education, Certain legislative members and committee	(e.g., Hackfield, Castle & Cooke, Brewer) Private school administration (e.g., Oahu College) Judiciary	Educators of American descent Descendants of Hawaiian monarchy who were sympathetic to American business District school superintendents School principals	Teachers Other parochial school administrators Presidentially appointed school advisory committees	Native Hawaiians Immigrants: Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Portuguese, and other Polynesian groups
1945-1960s	Governor of Hawai'i Democratic Party State financial department Legislative committee on education and certain legislators	Federal monies (e.g., military and minority) Labor unions (e.g., ILWU) Elected school board New business and industry (e.g., tourism) Judiciary	District school superintendents Department of Education Teachers association (Hawaii Education Association)	School administrators Teachers Appointed school advisory committees Parent groups	Native Hawaiians Majority of immigrants (excluding Japanese)

Although the first half of the twentieth century saw the waning of the power of the Republican oligarchy, the structure of school governance and policy decisions continued to be restrictive. Ultimately, policy influentials have argued that Hawai'i's school system would be best served by statewide policy made at the upper level (centralized) and operationalized on the local level (decentralized), thereby producing a balance between control and participation. Inevitably, lack of authority on the local level has created public discontent, which has been aimed at the leaders of the Democratic legislature and the school board.

As a result of public displeasure with the schools and an increased awareness of civil rights groups, the forgotten players (e.g., Native Hawaiians, Filipinos) have begun to exercise stronger influence in the educational policy process. A comprehensive approach to battling poverty was actualized due to federal intervention (e.g., Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965). Special interests focused attention on the needs of the handicapped and disabled. While Native Hawaiian activists initiated programs (e.g., Kupuna Language Program, Hawaiian immersion schools) to save the native language and culture. Continuing public dissatisfaction with local schools has created a need for parental options. The state educational system today has relaxed its local school attendance policy, with about 7 percent of Hawai'i's public school students taking advantage of a district-exemption program which allows them to attend schools of their choice. Moreover, 18 percent of the state's students (against 13 percent nationally) opt for private school attendance, and up to 5 percent of the potential students at some school campuses are being home-schooled. Such figures suggest considerable support for choice in education, as only 70 to 75 percent of Hawai'i's children attend their neighborhood public schools.

The increased activity by special-interest groups in redressing inequities, however, has not curtailed the near circle influence of Hawai'i businesses. Renewed attention to decentralization first appeared in the form of a report compiled by Berman, Weiler Associates for the Hawai'i Business Roundtable,²⁹ a committee convened by the governor to undertake the objective of making Hawai'i's schools "second to none." A scan of the committee members finds represen-

tation from nearly all of Hawai'i's new and old major corporations (i.e., C. Brewer, Alexander & Baldwin, Castle & Cooke, Theo. H. Davies) with very little representation from educational practitioners and scholars. Hawai'i's Department of Education continues to manage a centralized school system. The state Constitution of 1978 affirms a single school district headed by a thirteen-member elected Board of Education that, although having no fiscal authority, can formulate educational policy in accordance with state law. Although they are an elected body accountable to the general public, the Board of Education is an executive department and therefore must be accountable to the governor. This unique situation serves to restrict control of the schools to a few key policy influentials.³⁰

During the 1980s and into the 1990s, "equality of opportunity" has become an implicit objective of many special-interest groups and grassroots organizations in Hawai'i, although somewhat later than in many other states. In an effort to bridge the social inequities of the recent past, educational policy in the areas of curriculum and student services have begun to address the needs of the disabled, the poor, the at-risk, the Native Hawaiian, and other ethnic groups. Although resources have been allocated to redress inequities in some areas, because financial power is still rigidly maintained by the state legislature and the governor, proposed allocations to a variety of educational programs compete line-by-line with all other programs in the governor's budget.

Within a historical context rooted in colonialism, consisting of a socioeconomic past that is not unlike the South (e.g., plantation living, segregated schooling), fundamental change in Hawai'i has been nearly impossible because of well-established traditions and symbols regarding politics, governance, and school control that are inherent in the state's political culture. The key concern for policymakers attempting to introduce change that is concerned with equity is how to structure such proposed changes, given the pervasive norms of state political culture. What we learn from an analysis of a historically framed context is that despite periodic, and often strong, political and economic turmoil, the policy system in education has remained relatively unaffected in terms of political values pursued. Focusing on the continuities across the preceding case histories, the regularities

reveal that with the exception of some socialization of power occurring over the recent decade, the scope of conflict, even during turbulent political periods, tends to be privatized by the controlling elite, thereby maintaining centralized governance. Consequently, the persistent rule by an elite, which limits participation of others, efficiently aligns school policy and school-related activities (i.e., curriculum) with the beliefs and values of the political elite.

The effect then of educational policy over time has largely kept the Native Hawaiian voice "less" in defining school policy and culturally relevant school activities. Although a few Hawaiian immersion schools have been recently developed and state curricular policy mandates the teaching of Hawaiian culture and history, actual practice reveals a need for more resource attention. Yet, for the most part, governmental control over school policy still obscures any meaningful attempts to reform the public schools in ways that embrace cultural plurality and educational parity for all children.

NOTES

¹ See Maenette Benham, "Political and Cultural Determinants of Educational Policymaking: Their Effects on Native Hawaiians" (Ed.D. diss., U of Hawai'i, 1993). See also Maenette Benham and Ronald Heck, *Culture and Educational Policy in Hawaii: The Silencing of Native Voices* (Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998).

² This wedded linkage between the governance of the people and religious/spiritual precepts became significant to the success of the American missionary.

³ This is not to suggest that Hawai'i's religion was made up of superstitions but instead reflects the conflict that grew between the *kapu* system and Western technology.

⁴ Jocelyn Linnekin, *Children of the Land: Exchange and Status in a Hawaiian Community* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 1985).

⁵ Helena G. Allen, *The Betrayal of Liliuokalani: Last Queen of Hawaii. 1838-1917* (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1982) 25.

⁶ Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, vol. 1, 1778-1854: *Foundation and Transformation* (Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1983).

⁷ Chapter VII, Constitutional Laws of Hawai'i, 1842.

⁸ Chapter LII, Additional School Law, Laws of Hawai'i, 1842.

⁹ Chapter VII, Constitutional Laws of Hawai'i, 1842.

¹⁰ Benjamin O. Wist, *A Century of Public Education in Hawaii* (Honolulu: Hawaii Educational Review, 1940) 26.

- ¹¹ Quoted in Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom* 108–09.
- ¹² S. M. Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*, rev. ed. (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools P, 1992) 270–71.
- ¹³ Because, in the Hawaiian mind, governance and religion/spirituality were inseparable, core values, beliefs, and governing principles were grounded in Christianity.
- ¹⁴ The transition of power from the native monarchy to American control was essentially a peaceful movement with the integral support of the descendants of the American missionaries who held influential positions in Hawai'i's government. In addition, American capital, which had supported the fledgling kingdom's treasury, became a dominant political tool by the end of the Kamehameha dynasty in 1872.
- ¹⁵ David Tyack, *The One Best System* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1974) 276.
- ¹⁶ W. R. Castle, "Sketch of Constitutional History in Hawaii." In *23rd Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society* (Honolulu: Paradise of the Pacific Press, 1981) 13–27.
- ¹⁷ All were either descendants of American missionaries or affiliated with American businesses.
- ¹⁸ See Tyack, *The One Best System*.
- ¹⁹ Republic's Constitution of 1896, Act 57.
- ²⁰ Republic's Constitution of 1896, Act 57.
- ²¹ Wist, *A Century of Public Education* 123.
- ²² Wist, *A Century of Public Education* 138.
- ²³ To suggest that educational policy alone negatively affected Native Hawaiians' academic, economic, and social position would be more than naive; however, it cannot go unsaid that the public schools played an integral role. Educational policy and school-related activities embodied core beliefs that valued efficient control and quality American programs. For example, students were taught to think in English (not Hawaiian or local pidgin) and to act as moral American citizens (not heathens). The process of socialization in the public and independent schools, coupled with the political turmoil of the latter 1800s in which Hawaiians lost their sovereignty, their queen, and their land created deep-seated resentment among the Native Hawaiians toward the haoles. This psychological barrier toward participation in any activity that was American resulted in a Native Hawaiian population that was less capable of competing in Hawai'i's new economy, social structure, and academic institutions.
- ²⁴ Andrew W. Lind, *Hawaii's People*, 4th ed. (Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1980).
- ²⁵ MacCaughey, "Public Elementary Schools of Hawaii, A Synopsis of the Purposes and Conditions of the Public Elementary Education in the Territory of Hawaii," *PP* Dec. 1909: 34.
- ²⁶ See Mary Kawena Pukui, E. W. Haertig, and Catherine A. Lee, *Nānā I ke kumu* (Honolulu: Hui Hanai, 1972) 2: 303.
- ²⁷ MacCaughey, "Public Elementary Schools of Hawaii" 33.

²⁸ See quotation in Roger Bell, *Last Among Equals: Hawaiian Statehood and American Politics* (Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1984) 104.

²⁹ See report written by Paul Berman, Joanne Izu, Robert McClland, and Patricia Stone, *The Hawai'i Plan: Educational Excellence for the Pacific Area. Recommendations to the Hawai'i Business Roundtable* (Honolulu: Hawai'i Business Round Table, 1988).

³⁰ Recently, however, there has been growing support to create an independent school board that would have power to raise or lower state income taxes for education. See "Educational governance is hot issue: Who runs Hawai'i's public schools? Should this be changed?" *Honolulu Advertiser*, Feb. 11, 1994, A-1, 3.